



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,620	07/08/2006	Ye Liu	10583.204-US	4066
25508	7590	04/03/2008	EXAMINER	
NOVOZYMES NORTH AMERICA, INC.			RAGHUV, GANAPATHIRAM	
500 FIFTH AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1600			1652	
NEW YORK, NY 10110				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/03/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/585,620	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LIU ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> GANAPATHIRAMA RAGHU	<b>Art Unit</b> 1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 18-36 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 18-36 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Detailed Action***

Claims 18-36 are pending.

***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I: Claims 18-29 and 36 in part, drawn to an isolated polypeptide having amylase activity encoding polynucleotide, vectors, host cells, the method of making the said polypeptide and composition comprising said polypeptide.

Group II: Claim 30-32, drawn to a process for preparing a dough-based product comprising the elected polypeptide of group I.

Group III: Claim 33-35, drawn to a process for preparing a dough-based product comprising adding a first and second amylase to a dough, wherein the first amylase is derived from a fungus and the second amylase is a maltogenic alpha-amylase.

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

An international or a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following categories:

- 1) A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product or
- 2) A product and process of use of said product; or

- 3) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product and a use of said product; or
- 4) A process and an apparatus or means specifically adapted for carrying out the said process; or
- 5) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process.

37 CFR 1.475(c) states: If an application contains more or less than one of the combination of categories of in an invention set forth in paragraph (b) of this section, unity of invention might not be present.

In addition, the PCT does not provide for multiple products or methods within single application, therefore, unity of invention is lacking with regard to Groups I-III; see 37 CFR 1.475. 37 CFR 1.475 (d) also states: If multiple products, processes of manufacture or uses are claimed, the first invention of the category first mentioned in the claims of the application and the first recited invention of each other categories related thereto will be considered as the main invention in the claims, see PCT Article 17(3)(a) 1.47(c).

37 CFR 1.475(e) further states; the determination whether a group of invention is so linked as to form a single inventive concept shall be without regard to whether the inventions are claimed in separate claims or as alternative within a single claim.

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical feature for the following reasons: Group I has a special technical feature of a polypeptide sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2 or 19, which Group III does not share, and Group II lack

unity for reasons cited above [see 37 CFR 1.475; 37 CFR 1.475(d)]. Further, the process for preparing a dough-based product comprising adding a first and second amylase to a dough (Group III), do not share a corresponding special technical feature, because the prior art clearly teaches isolation and purification alpha-amylase and preparation of dough products (see Michelsen et al., WO 96/01323, in IDS). Therefore, the only shared technical feature of these claims polypeptides having amylase activity and encoding polynucleotides does not constitute a special technical feature as defined in PCT Rule 13.2 as it is not a feature which defines a contribution of the claimed invention makes over the prior art. The methods of Groups II-III do not share any technical feature as they comprise unrelated steps and produce unrelated effects. The methods of Groups II-III do not share any technical feature and do not have unity of invention with Group I as Group I already includes a method of use of the DNA which comprises unrelated steps to the methods of Groups II-III, and 37 CFR 1.475 does not provide for the inclusion of multiple methods of use within the main invention.

Searching more than one of Groups I-III would represent a burden on the Office for the following reasons. Because the products used in the method of Groups II-III and the product of Group I does not share a special structural and functional feature, a search for any one said product would not encompass a search for any other said products used in the method of Groups II-III. Thus, the search for more than one of Groups I-III would be a burden on the Office. These inventions lack Unity of Invention for the reasons given above. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes, as indicated, is proper.

*Election of Sequence*

Group I contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct sequences of the claimed invention: the various sequences recited in the claims, polypeptide sequences SEQ ID

NOs: 2 and 19 have specific activities. Furthermore these sequences have different structure and function. The above products can be used exclusive of each other such that they do not share unity of invention under 37 CFR 1.475.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372 to elect a single appropriate disclosed SEQ ID NO: associated with the respective group for prosecution on the merits to which the claims are restricted. Note that this is a restriction requirement to sequence and NOT a species election.

MPEP 803.04 states: Nucleotide sequences encoding different proteins are structurally distinct chemical compounds and are unrelated to one another. These sequences are thus deemed to normally constitute independent and distinct inventions with the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121. Absent evidence to the contrary, each such nucleotide sequence is presumed to represent an independent and distinct invention, subject to a restriction requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 CFR 1.141et seq. It has been determined that 1(ONE) sequence constitutes a reasonable number for examination purposes under the present conditions. At present the huge number of submissions of claims directed to various sequences, such as nucleic acids or polypeptides, is so large that the election of sequence of this type is now deemed to be practically appropriate so as to not overwhelm the examination and search processes for such claims. Examination will be restricted to only the elected group and the elected amino acid /nucleotide sequence.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

***Rejoinder of restricted inventions***

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitation of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of M.P.E.P. 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitation of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 C.F.R. 1.312.

In the event of a rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.104. thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet the criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. 103(b), 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or otherwise include the limitation of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See M.P.E.P. 804.01.

***Final Comments***

To insure that each document is properly filed in the electronic file wrapper, it is requested that each of amendments to the specification, amendments to the claims, Applicants' remarks, requests for extension of time, and any other distinct papers be submitted on separate pages.

It is also requested that Applicants identify support, within the original application, for any amendments to the claims and specification.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ganapathirama Raghu whose telephone number is 571-272-4533. The examiner can normally be reached between 8 am-4: 30 pm EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nashaat Nashed can be reached on 571-272-0934. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 for regular communications and for After Final

Art Unit: 1652

communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of the application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ganapathirama Raghu, Ph.D.

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1652

Mar. 24, 2008.

/Tekchand Saidha/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1652